

1 MICHAEL LADRA (State Bar No. 064307)
KENNETH B. WILSON (State Bar No. 130009)
2 JAMES C. YOON (State Bar No. 177155)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
3 Professional Corporation
650 Page Mill Road
4 Palo Alto, California 94304-1050
Telephone: (650) 493-9300

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
6 SANDISK CORPORATION

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 SANDISK CORPORATION,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 LEXAR MEDIA, INC.,

13 Defendant.

CASE NO.: C98-01115 CRB

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANT LEXAR MEDIA, INC.'S
CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY

Date: March 10, 2000

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer

Dept: Courtroom 8

16 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM.
17

18 This cross-motion for summary judgment came before the Court after notice and briefing
19 by the parties, plaintiff SanDisk Corporation ("SanDisk") and defendant Lexar Media, Inc.
20 ("Lexar"), and a hearing on March 10, 2000. After review and consideration of the materials and
21 arguments presented to the Court by the parties and good cause appearing, the Court hereby rules
22 that:

23 Defendant Lexar Media, Inc.'s Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity is
24 hereby DENIED.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.
26

27 Dated: _____

28 THE HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

1 MICHAEL A. LADRA (State Bar No. 064307)
KENNETH B. WILSON (State Bar No. 130009)
2 JAMES C. YOON (State Bar No. 177155)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
3 Professional Corporation
650 Page Mill Road
4 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
Telephone: (650) 493-9300
5 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
SANDISK CORPORATION
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
11

12 SANDISK CORPORATION, a Delaware
corporation,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 LEXAR MEDIA, INC., a California corporation,

16 Defendant.
17
18
19
20

CASE NO.: C98-01115 CRB (PJH)

EXHIBITS TO THE DECLARATION
OF MARCIAN E. HOFF, JR., Ph.D. IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF SANDISK
CORPORATION'S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT LEXAR MEDIA,
INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY

Date: March 10, 2000

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept: 8

Before: The Honorable Charles R.
Breyer

21
22 VOL. I OF III

23 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
24 UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER

25 THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBJECT TO A PROTECTIVE ORDER ISSUED
26 BY THE COURT. THIS ENVELOPE IS NOT TO BE OPENED NOR
27 ARE THE CONTENTS TO BE EXAMINED, DISPLAYED, REVEALED,
28 OR COPIED EXCEPT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

MAR 04 1998

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SANDISK CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

No. C 98-01115 CRB

v.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

LEXAR MEDIA, INC.,

Defendant.

Before the Court are the parties' motions for claims construction on the disputed language and means elements of United States Patent No. 5,602,987 (the '987). The '987 discloses a non-volatile memory system for use in a host computer system. Having carefully considered the papers in this matter and having had the benefit of oral argument on February 22, 1998 at the Markman hearing, the Court provides the following claims construction.

I. Legal Standard

Patent infringement analysis involves two steps: the proper construction of the asserted claim and a determination as to whether the accused method or product infringes the asserted claim as properly construed. See Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 52 F.3d 967, 976 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), aff'd 517 U.S. 370, (1996). Interpretation and construction of patent claims is a matter of law for determination exclusively by the court. See id. at 979.

"In interpreting an asserted claim, the court should look first to the intrinsic evidence

COPIES MAILED TO
PARTIES OF RECORD

1 of record, i.e., the patent itself, including the claims, the specification and, if in evidence, the
2 prosecution history.” Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir.
3 1996). In examining the intrinsic evidence, the court should first look at the words of the
4 claims themselves to define the scope of the patented invention. See id. While “words in a
5 claim are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning,” a patentee may alter the
6 meaning of any words as long as the special definition is clearly stated in the patent
7 specification or file history.” Id.

8 Second, the court should always review the patent specification “to determine whether
9 the inventor has used any terms in a manner inconsistent with their ordinary meaning.” Id.
10 The specification is a written description of the invention which is designed to be clear and
11 complete enough so that a person of ordinary skill in the art could make and use the
12 invention. Drawings included in the patent application have the same impact on and effect
13 on claim language as other portions of the specifications. See Autogiro Co. of America v.
14 United States, 384 F.2d 391, 398 (Ct. Cl. 1967). “The specification acts as a dictionary
15 when it expressly defines terms used in the claims or when it defines terms by implication.”
16 Vitronics, 90 F.3d at 1582. The Federal Circuit teaches that, “the specification is always
17 highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually it is dispositive; it is the single
18 best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” Id.

19 The third type of intrinsic evidence that the Court may consider is the prosecution
20 history of the patent, if it is in evidence. The prosecution history, also known as the “file
21 wrapper,” contains the entire record of the prosecution of the patent claim before the patent
22 office, including any representations about the scope of the claim made by the applicant.

23 In most cases, analysis of the intrinsic evidence alone will resolve any ambiguity in a
24 disputed term. “In those cases where the public record unambiguously describes the scope of
25 the patented invention, reliance on any extrinsic evidence is improper.” Vitronics, 90 F.3d at
26 1583. The rationale behind this type of claim construction is clear:

27 The claims, specification, and file history constitute the public
28 record of the patentee’s claim, a record on which the public is
 entitled to rely. In other words, competitors are entitled to review
 the public record, apply the established rules of claim construction,

ascertain the scope of the patentee's claimed invention and, thus, design around the claimed invention.

Vitronics, 90 F.3d at 1583 (citing Markman, 52 F.3d at 978-79). If extrinsic evidence was looked to in the first instance, the right and ability of a competitor to read and construe the claim from the public record and then design around the invention would be meaningless. For these reasons, "[o]nly if there [is] still some genuine ambiguity in the claims, after consideration of all available intrinsic evidence, should the trial court [] resort[] to extrinsic evidence." Vitronics, 90 F.3d at 1584. In fact, in those cases in which intrinsic evidence unambiguously describes the scope of the patent and defines the claim language, it is error to rely on extrinsic evidence such as expert testimony, inventor testimony, dictionaries, technical treatises or articles. See Bell & Howard Document Mgmt Co. Products v. Altek Systems, 132 F.3d 701, 705-6 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

When construing the claims of a patent, a court may also consider the doctrine claim differentiation. Under that doctrine, "[w]here some claims are broad and others narrow, the narrow claim limitations cannot be read into the broad whether to avoid invalidity or to escape infringement." United States v. Teletronics Inc., 857 F.2d 778, 783 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In other words, the doctrine presumes there is a difference in scope among the claims of a patent. See Tandon Corp. v. United States Int'l Trade Comm'n, 831 F.2d 1017, 1023 (Fed.Cir.1987). Nonetheless, the doctrine "can not broaden claims beyond their correct scope, determined in light of the specification and the prosecution history and any relevant extrinsic evidence. . . . [C]laims that are written in different words may ultimately cover substantially the same subject matter." Multi-form Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd., 133 F.3d 1473, 1479 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

II. Claim Construction.

The parties dispute the meaning of certain terms used in independent claims 1, 10, 17, 23 and 35. They also dispute what are the corresponding structures with respect to the means-plus-function elements in claims 17 and 23. The parties' proposed orders cover significantly more terms and issues than were addressed by the parties in their memoranda. The Court's order, however, will be limited to those terms and issues discussed by both

1 parties in their memoranda and at the claim construction hearing. The Court has determined
2 that the disputed claims can be construed without resort to extrinsic evidence, and the Court
3 has not relied on extrinsic evidence in construing the claims as explained below.

4 **A. Disputed Terms.**

5 **1. Sector (Claims 1, 10, 17, 23 & 35)**

6 A "non-volatile memory sector" is the basic unit of erase for the non-volatile memory.
7 It is not limited to 512 bytes of user data and 64 bytes of overhead data.

8 **2. Partitioned (Claims 1, 10, 17, 23 & 35)**

9 "Partitioned" refers to either logically dividing or physically dividing the memory into
10 a plurality of sectors. When the patent refers to the memory array being "partitioned" into
11 sectors it is not necessarily referring to the physical division of the memory into sectors such
12 that each sector must be physically separated from the adjoining sectors.

13 **3. User data and overhead data portions (Claims 1 & 10)**

14 Each non-volatile memory sector must have at least one user data portion and one
15 overhead data portion, but is not limited to only one data user portion and only one overhead
16 data portion.

17 **4. An array of non-volatile floating gate memory cells (Claims 1, 10 &
18 35 Preamble)**

19 The term "floating gate" in the preamble of claims 1, 10 and 35 forms the antecedent
20 basis for the use of the phrase "memory cells" in the body of these claims and their
21 dependent claims. The term is therefore a substantive limitation on the claims.

22 **5. "Designating" and "Generating" a memory address (Claims 1, 10 &
23 35)**

24 The terms "designate" and "generate" refer to the step of identifying the address of the
25 non-volatile memory sector selected by the controller. "Generate" as used in claims 1, 10 &
26 35 does not mean to cause the controller to execute a computer code to create such an
27 address.

28 **6. Correspond or corresponding (Claims 1, 10, 17 & 35)**

A non-volatile memory sector may correspond to one or more magnetic disk sectors.

7. Linking (Claim 1)

"Linking" refers generally to the substitution of the address of a usable non-volatile memory sector for an unusable non-volatile memory sector. Claim 1 does not limit "linking" to storing the address of a substitute sector in the defective sector overhead data portion.

8. Mass Memory Storage Block and Block Address (Claims 23 & 35)

"Mass memory storage block" refers to the basic unit of data (read/write) of the mass memory storage device being emulated by the inventions of the '987 patent. "Mass memory storage block address" is the address for this basic unit of data.

B. Means-Plus-Function Claims

Claims 17 and 23 contain elements that are written in a "means-plus-function" format. A means-plus-function element must be "construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof." 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6. Section 112, paragraph 6 "'operates to cut back on the type of means which could literally satisfy the claim language.'" Jonsson v. The Stanley Works, 903 F.2d 812, 819 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (citation omitted). To construe such a claim the court must first identify the specified function. Second, the court must "consult the specification to define a structure, material or acts corresponding to this claimed function." Sage Prods., Inc. v. Devon Indus., Inc., 126 F.3d 1420, 1428 (Fed. Cir. 1997). "A structure disclosed in the specification is only deemed to be 'corresponding structure' if the specification clearly links or associates that structure to the function recited in the claim." Kahn v. General Motors Corp., 135 F.3d 1472, 1476 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

1. Claim 17.

Claim 17 has four "means" elements. Each is addressed below.

a. "means connectable to said computer system for controlling operation of the [memory] array"

This means element refers to the function performed by a memory system that allows the memory system to be connected to a host computer system and control the operation of an array of non-volatile floating gate memory cells.

The corresponding structure is controller 31. The corresponding structures also

1 include those discussed below, in sections b through d, since claim 17 provides that the
2 "means connectable to said computer system for controlling operation of the array" include
3 the means that follow it in the claim.

- 4 b. means responsive to receipt of a magnetic disk sector address
5 from the host computer system for addressing a
6 corresponding non-volatile memory sector

7 This means element requires that the "means for controlling" as identified above
8 perform the function of relating at least one magnetic disk sector to at least one non-volatile
9 memory sector.

10 The corresponding structures are controller 31, and included within controller 31 the
11 microprocessor interface 505, address generator 503, command sequencer 511, multiplexer
12 513, address register 231, and address decoder 233.

- 13 c. means for reading the overhead data stored in the
14 addressed sector prior to reading the user data from, or
15 writing user data to, the addressed sector

16 This means element performs the function of reading overhead data in the non-volatile
17 memory sector before the controller reads or writes data to the user data portion of the
18 sector.

19 The corresponding structures are controller 31, microprocessor interface 505, DMA
20 controller 507, command sequencer 511, address generator 503, multiplexer 513, receiver
21 515, defect pointer memory file/header compare 509, alternative defects data file 517, serial
22 data lines 35 and 37, interface 40, logic and resisters 57, lines 209, serial interface 227,
23 address register 231, address decoder 233, command register 225 and command decoder 229.

- 24 d. means responsive to the read overhead data for
25 executing an instruction from the host computer system
26 to perform a designated one or reading user data from,
27 or writing user data to, the addressed sector

28 The function of this means element is to execute an instruction to read user data from
the user data portion or write user data to the user data portion of non-volatile addressed
memory sector after reading the overhead data from any overhead data portion.

 The corresponding structures are controller 31, including microprocessor interface
505, address generator 503, command sequencer 511, receiver 515, comparator 521, holding

1 register file 509, alternative defects data file 517 and multiplexer 523 (for reading) or
2 multiplexers 513 and 605 (for writing).

3 2. Claim 23.

4 Claim 23 includes one additional disputed means element that is not included in claim
5 17.

6 1. *means . . . for substituting another usable sector*

7 This means element requires the function of substituting a usable sector of non-
8 volatile memory for an addressed unusable sector of non-volatile memory.

9 The corresponding structures are controller 31, including receiver 515 and defect
10 pointer memory file/header compare (holding file register) 509.

11 **III. MOTIONS TO STRIKE**

12 Defendant's motions to strike are DENIED. The motions are concerned primarily
13 with plaintiff's submission of extrinsic evidence in support of its claim construction. As is
14 set forth above, the Court did not rely on any of the voluminous extrinsic evidence submitted
15 by both parties in construing the claims. To the extent that the Court relied upon plaintiff's
16 references to the specification and prosecution history that were not identified in the Joint
17 Claim Construction Statement, defendant has not demonstrated that it has been prejudiced by
18 plaintiff's untimely disclosure. The specification and prosecution history were available to
19 defendant long before plaintiff filed its claim construction memorandum and defendant had
20 ample time to study any additional references to the specification or prosecution history
21 made by plaintiff in its claim construction statement before defendant's responsive brief was
22 due.

23 **CONCLUSION**

24 For the foregoing reasons, the Court construes the disputed terms and elements of the
25 '987 patent as is set forth above and defendant's motions to strike are DENIED.

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27 Dated: March 4, 1999

28 
CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE